

Cutting Through the Clutter: The Potential of LLMs for Efficient Filtration in Systematic Literature Reviews

Lucas Joos , Daniel A. Keim , and Maximilian T. Fischer 




Figure 1: **Conceptual schematic overview of the process for leveraging a set of Large Language Model (LLM)-based agents for structured academic literature filtration as part of a systematic literature review (SLR):** Large scholarly repositories are scraped using an initial set of (broad) keywords, leading to a large (but manageable) corpus of potentially relevant papers. A set of different LLMs is tasked to classify the papers based on their title and abstract alone via a prompt describing the exact research field and direction. Using a consensus voting scheme, papers are either rejected or included for the survey selection, simultaneously providing a written justification for each selection, which can be supervised interactively and, if necessary, refined by the users.

Abstract—In academic research, systematic literature reviews are foundational and highly relevant, yet tedious to create due to the high volume of publications and labor-intensive processes involved. Systematic selection of relevant papers through conventional means like keyword-based filtering techniques can sometimes be inadequate, plagued by semantic ambiguities and inconsistent terminology, which can lead to sub-optimal outcomes. To mitigate the required extensive manual filtering, we explore and evaluate the potential of using Large Language Models (LLMs) to enhance the efficiency, speed, and precision of literature review filtering, reducing the amount of manual screening required. By using models as classification agents acting on a structured database only, we prevent common problems inherent in LLMs, such as hallucinations. We evaluate the real-world performance of such a setup during the construction of a recent literature survey paper with initially more than 8.3k potentially relevant articles under consideration and compare this with human performance on the same dataset. Our findings indicate that employing advanced LLMs like GPT-4o, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, Gemini 1.5 Flash, or Llama3 with simple prompting can significantly reduce the time required for literature filtering—from usually weeks of manual research to only a few minutes. Simultaneously, we crucially show that false negatives can indeed be controlled through a consensus scheme, achieving recalls $> 98.8\%$ at or even beyond the typical human error threshold, thereby also providing for more accurate and relevant articles selected. Our research not only demonstrates a substantial improvement in the methodology of literature reviews but also sets the stage for further integration and extensive future applications of responsible AI in academic research practices.

Index Terms—Systematic literature survey, automatic literature filtering, relevance scoring, evaluation, large language models

1 INTRODUCTION

Literature reviews, and in particular *systematic literature reviews* (SLR), have been described as the preferred or “gold” standard for conducting literature research in academia [6, 19]. They provide a transparent and in particular reproducible approach to systematically synthesize and categorize research findings, thereby providing an ideally unbiased overview of existing knowledge on a particular topic [14]. Such reviews help identify research gaps and set directions for future studies, ensuring consistency and reliability in academic research [13], having a long history dating back at least to the 18th century [21].

The creation of systematic literature reviews, however, so far has been a primarily manual and highly labor-intensive process [17]. Authors need to have a good grasp of their research field to survey, categorize, and code a large number of potentially relevant publications. While this can be feasible for highly specialized research areas, for a larger field, or with the increasing publication volume, this can become difficult for larger SLR, where this process often can take months to complete. One of the most time-consuming tasks in creating an SLR

can be the initial, reproducible selection of relevant papers based on inclusion and exclusion criteria and their manual verification, particularly in domains or research fields where classical keyword-based filtering may lead to ambiguous results. According to Wallace et al. [22], an experienced peer-reviewer can manually screen about two papers per minute based on title and abstract. At this rate, a corpus of about 8,000 potentially relevant publications for a large SLR requires approximately 66 person-hours (about one and a half full work weeks) of *uninterrupted* work time. Effects like fatigue, loss of accuracy, inefficiencies, dual verification, and other work commitments typically increase the required time frame significantly, resulting in survey latency times closer to a few months for the initial screening alone. Given the repetitive but still demanding nature of the tasks and the ever-faster progress in academia, it stands to reason if—and how—this process can be improved upon.

Using automation for such a (relatively) well-defined classification task is not a new idea, with the first use of automation being reported in the mid-2000s [21]. However, the recent advancements of LLM prove promising for the tasks of initial literature filtration during the creation of systematic literature surveys primarily due to two reasons: (1) their capability to understand nuanced semantic ambiguities, potential to

• L. Joos, D. A. Keim, and M. T. Fischer are with the University of Konstanz. E-mail: {lucas.joos, keim, max.fischer}@uni-konstanz.de.

reach an accuracy (recall, precision) threshold that makes their use feasible, and (2) their unparalleled speed and cost-efficiency compared to the human labor cost. While existing LLM chatbots have been used to similar ends through their ability to search external databases through function calls, limited research has been conducted on a schematic pipeline of the whole *process* from repository acquisition to final paper selection and its *evaluation*, ensuring *completeness*, *reliability*, and *accountability*, which is the focus of this research.

In this work, we present a quantitative evaluation and discussion of the potential of LLMs for initial filtration during the creation of systematic literature reviews, making the following contributions:

- A **conceptual schema** for the structured literature filtration process leveraging LLM-based agents
- An extensive **evaluation** for a large (8.3k papers) SLR, performing a case study to compare (1) *human filtering*, (2) *open-source LLMs* (Llama3 8B and 70B), and (3) *SOTA commercial LLMs* (GPT-4o, Gemini Flash 1.5, Claude 3.5 Sonnet) performance
- An extensive **discussion** on the pitfalls, potentials, and future prospects of leveraging AI agents for literature filtration

With this work, we aim to provide guidance and insights into how AI can reduce the work required for systematic literature reviews while simultaneously raising awareness of the risks and challenges involved.

2 RELATED WORK

There exists a large body of research on how to conduct literature reviews [6, 13, 14, 19]. However, many of the developed methods are labor-intensive and repetitive. With the recent successes of machine learning [17, 22] and in particular LLM’s, there have been initial proposals [16] to leverage language models for some parts of the tasks involved, enhancing traditional data science analysis. These include either agent-based systems which help with the formulation, filtering and search of a research domain [16, 24], using LLMs for specific keyword generation and retrieval through RAG [1], or more generally, how machine learning [17, 21, 22] but also LLMs [2, 15, 20] can support the process.

One particular aspect that has received less attention is the accurate filtering and classification of a (relatively) large body of potentially relevant research concerning a particular research question to speed up the *paper pre-selection process*. This is particularly relevant for topics or domains where keyword-based filtering is problematic or difficult to use, for example, due to semantic ambiguities or duplicated word use.

3 METHODOLOGY

To evaluate the applicability of LLMs for pre-filtering the paper corpus for an SLR, we followed a structured methodology, starting with a topic definition, using a recent literature survey (under review): “Graph Exploration in Immersive Settings”. This topic leads to a sufficiently large corpus of potential papers since all papers dealing with some immersive technology, such as Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality, and others, focusing on the widespread data type of graphs are of relevance. For the initial paper selection, we structurally searched for keywords in paper titles and abstracts of potential paper candidates in major computer science repositories. For our exemplary case, we included papers from the *ACM Digital Library*, *IEEE Xplore*, and *Eurographics*. After

You are a professor in computer science conducting a literature review. Please decide and classify if the following paper belongs to a specific research direction or not. For this, you are provided with the title and the abstract, which should give you sufficient information for an informed and accurate decision.

The research direction is the topic of "TITEL".

Therefore include papers that deal with ASPECT_1, ASPECT_2, ... Examples of ASPECT_1 are: term 1, term 2, ...

You MUST discard papers that EXCLUSION_EXCEPTION_1, ...

You MUST include papers that INCLUSION_EXCEPTION_1, ...

Below is the title and abstract. You must only answer with INCLUDE or DISCARD and a 2-sentence reason of why.

Figure 2: Prompt template for the individual agents

Table 1: **Evaluation results** of the individual LLM agents and two consensus schemes (all tested models and high-quality models only) for our reference survey, with the validated human classification as ground truth.

Metric	Llama-3 (8B) ¹	Llama-3 (70B) ²	Gemini 1.5 Flash ³	Claude 3.5 Sonnet ⁴	GPT-4o ⁵	Consensus (All) ⁶	Consensus (Best) ⁷	
Counts	TP (↑)	86	85	67	76	80	87	87
	FP (↓)	774	194	91	95	50	862	167
	TN (↑)	7461	8041	8144	8140	8185	7373	8068
	FN (↓)	2	3	21	12	8	1	1
Evaluation	Acc (↑)	90.68	97.63	98.65	98.71	99.30	89.63	97.98
	P (↑)	10.00	30.47	42.41	44.44	61.54	9.17	34.25
	R (↑)	97.73	96.59	76.14	86.36	90.91	98.86	98.86
	F ₁ (↑)	18.14	46.32	54.47	58.69	73.39	16.78	50.88

¹ meta-llama-3-8b-instruct.Q8_0 ² meta-llama-3-70b-instruct.Q4_K_M ³ gemini-1.5-flash-001
⁴ claude-3-5-sonnet@20240620 ⁵ gpt-4o-2024-05-13 ⁶ Consensus between all (five) models needed to discard a paper, otherwise included as a potential candidate. ⁷ Same, but only models with F₁ > 50% (e.g. without Llama3 variants).

unifying the format of the paper metadata, removing duplicates, and excluding all non-paper publications, we retrieved an initial corpus of **8,323** papers. All of these papers were manually screened in multiple iterations to distill the set of papers that actually needed to be considered for the survey paper. This process was highly time-consuming, involving multiple researchers for multiple weeks, but led to the ground truth categorization: for the initial corpus, we identified **88** papers that needed to be included and **8235** to discard. Based on our ground-truth categorization, we investigate the potential for LLMs to facilitate the laborious process of filtering a paper corpus, considering five open and commercial state-of-the-art foundation models (see Table 1 for details).

We initially tested the LLMs with different prompt styles, asking the models to classify each paper individually, and quickly found a basic prompt schema that works well. In this schema, we clearly tell the LLM its **context and role**, its **overall task**, before concluding with an output format and the paper **title and abstract**.

The initial tests revealed patterns of papers that were erroneously included or excluded. Therefore, we also added further **exclusion and inclusion criteria** to the final prompt (see Figure 2). With it, we achieved good results for test samples, were satisfied with the explanations of the LLMs, and continued to let each LLM categorized all papers (independently), leading to the results in the following section.

4 EVALUATION

The results of the individual LLM classifications are summarized in Table 1. In general, the LLMs performed well with an accuracy above 90 % across all models. However, there are still notable differences: While the open-source models—especially Llama3 8B—were more conservative, including more papers in general (high FP rate), trying not to exclude any relevant papers (low FN rate), the commercial models discarded more papers (higher TN rate), but with the downside of having more papers erroneously excluded (higher FN rate). Interestingly, the falsely classified papers were mostly different across the LLMs: Regarding the erroneous *inclusions* (FP), for most papers, only one LLM—often Llama3 8B—was responsible for the wrong classification (see Figure 3). The number of papers to exclude that were falsely included by multiple LLMs is drastically lower. This is also the case for extremely relevant incorrectly discarded papers (FN), where mostly individual LLMs (mostly Gemini 1.5 Flash) generated errors, but false exclusion by multiple LLMs were way lower (see Figure 4). Therefore, we also analyzed the performance of a consensus voting of all LLMs—Consensus (All)—and a selection of the best-performing LLMs with an F₁ score above 50 %—Consensus (Best)—consisting of Gemini 1.5 Flash, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, and GPT-4o. For consensus voting, a paper is only discarded if all of the involved LLMs agree to discard it—and included if at least one LLM agrees. The results of both consensus approaches (see Table 1, right column) are highly encouraging, showing great results, especially for the **TP** and the **FN** rates. By consensus voting, only one paper would be discarded that should be part of the survey (based on the




Figure 3: Number of papers (gray background) that were *incorrectly (inc.)* voted to be *included (i.e., false positive)* by the agents, the logical opposite to Figure 4. These papers must be manually discarded during validation. It can be seen that the large majority of actually irrelevant inclusions originates from Llama3 8B and decreases with general model performance [10], leading to a higher degree of successful pre-filtering.

human ground-truth data). A manual inspection revealed that this paper was also an edge case for the involved researchers, who might have excluded the paper based on the abstract and title but ultimately included it after investigating its content. While both consensus approaches lead to the same **TP** and **FN** rates, which are of most relevance for our use case, the Consensus (Best) approach comes with a lower **FP** rate (see Figure 5), reducing the manual filtering process by 695 papers, and only requires three instead of five LLMs, reducing time and cost.

5 HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION

The results of our experiment show that the initial filtering process can be supported by LLMs. However, relying solely on (individual) LLMs without human intervention is of high risk. Therefore, we propose a new retrieval and filtering pipeline (see Figure 1) to form the paper corpus of survey papers, incorporating a tight collaboration between the researcher (human) and LLMs (AI). The first steps of our suggested pipeline remain the same as for classical paper retrieval (see Section 3): Online repositories are searched for papers that could be of relevance based on keywords, leading to a pre-processed initial paper corpus. Instead of requiring researchers to review all papers, we now incorporate multiple LLMs that classify each paper independently. The survey authors are an essential part of the process, as they create prompts—which may be informed by our template in Figure 2—and investigate sampled LLM output until the results are of sufficient quality. Investigating the LLM’s justification of their decisions is often highly useful for evaluating the prompt and for refining it. When the preliminary results are sufficient, all papers are classified by each LLM (or the most promising ones), and the results are combined through a consensus voting described above. As our evaluation demonstrated, consensus voting is highly effective in reducing the number of papers significantly, while the number of erroneously removed papers tends to be very low. The human classification can similarly lead to falsely removed papers, which will most likely be found in the following snowballing step (checking for references of included papers). Hence, having a few papers removed in the LLM step might be acceptable. In the last step, the researchers manually explore the remaining papers. With the highly reduced number of papers to analyze and the LLM explanations, the manual filtering step becomes way easier and more efficient.

6 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

In the following, we discuss the findings and lessons learned, the limitations of our approach, and potential future work.

6.1 Findings and Lessons Learned

We have shown that using AI techniques like LLM-based agents as part of a structured analysis pipeline can be beneficial in supporting the initial steps in a structured literature survey with surprising quality.

One main benefit is the **speed and low cost of filtration**: In our case study with 8,323 papers, the GPT-4o queries, for example, resulted in 4,432,169 input tokens, i.e., around 532 tokens per paper (including




Figure 4: Number of papers (gray background) that were *incorrectly (inc.)* voted to be *excluded (i.e., false negative)* by the agents, grouped by the number of incorrect agents involved in a decision. The individual bars show how many times a particular agent was involved in the wrong decision. It can be seen on the far right that only a single paper is unanimously misjudged by all agents (and therefore lost forever), demonstrating that N-Consensus voting is beneficial when prioritizing recall.

the command prompt) and 443,735 output tokens, i.e., around 53 per paper. This can be achieved at a very low cost in a matter of minutes (given July 2024 rate limits and costs at OpenAI, one can complete the filtration for a single agent in less than 10 minutes for 28.81 USD). This demonstrates the high **scalability**, given the ability to deploy LLMs 24/7 or scale them up by increasing available GPUs to handle large datasets, making them ideal for large-scale literature reviews. In comparison with a human, taking *at least* 69 hours of concentrated work, this significantly reduces the time and human cost required for the initial filtration of papers, making the creation of literature reviews more accessible and much faster.

When **cost or confidentiality** is a relevant factor, we have shown that even openly available, smaller quantized models like Llama3 8B, which can be executed locally on a modern laptop, can show very high recall rates of 97.73%, but at less good precision. Even though, this enables researchers at least coarsely to **inspect a potential research field** and reduce the potential manual search space by almost 90% (from 8323 to $86 + 774 = 860$) within a few hours (depending on GPU compute).

In particular of interest is that the **recall difference** between a group of best models and Llama3 8B alone was very low: only *one* additional paper was lost as a false positive. It is difficult to generalize why the model tended to favor inclusion over exclusion, which might also differ depending on the prompt format and would require further research. To increase the precision, the Consensus (Best) further drops the false positives from 774 to 167, i.e., a 98% validation space reduction in total, losing only one (of 88) actually relevant paper.

Given these rates, it becomes feasible to compare them to **human error thresholds**, which depend on many factors such as difficulty, familiarization, stress, and repetitiveness [18]. Many frameworks exist [12], like HEART (Human Error Assessment and Reduction Technique) [9], TESEO (Empirical Technique To Estimate Operator Errors) [4], and THERP (Technique for Human Error Rate Prediction) [11]. Rates in the order of 0.5% to 5% (TESEO), 2% to 9% (HEART) are suggested (all without validation passes), within the same range or even worse than our filtration. For our survey, we can report that the **initial manual filtration by humans** also was imperfect, and compared to the ground truth, the classification of 34 papers was changed after the first iteration during verification, highlighting the strengths of our approach.

A benefit of using LLMs is that through prompting, we can get **consistent and descriptive** classification explanations (but along with their inherent biases), whereas this would be even more work for a human and, therefore, is rarely done (e.g., listed in a survey as an appendix). Offloading tasks from the human can thereby lead to **improved resource allocation**, where the reduced need for manual filtering allows research teams to allocate resources more effectively, focusing on analysis and synthesis of more complex and interpretive aspects of literature reviews, improving overall productivity. Simultaneously, it reduces the risk of fatigue and the load of repetitive tasks on human workers. This enables researchers to potentially inspect a more **diverse** set of




Figure 5: **Pairwise comparison of the incorrect decisions by one or more agents.** The validated ground truth classification of a paper is shown in the top row (left part: included, right part: discarded), followed by the individual agents and then the two consensus methods. Incorrect exclusions (FN) can be seen as **red discarded** lines in the smaller left part, while incorrect inclusion (FP) can be seen as **green included** lines in the larger right part. One can spot the single incorrectly discarded (FN) paper for the consensus methods at the bottom far left, negatively affecting the recall.

research avenues and fields as the upfront indirect cost of an initial survey decreases. This could even be used by researchers to (manually) find gaps in the existing literature where there is no survey available but semi-automatically collecting relevant publications for a broader overview of the field just for their own research topics. As a side effect, while the lingua franca of academia is English, the ability of multilingual LLMs would also improve **accessibility of non-English academic literature**, as they can process and translate literature in multiple languages, broadening the scope of systematic reviews to include non-English publications, which might be relevant for some particular, specialized venues (or fields with older literature). Finally, the use of automation compared to manual research inherently optimizes **data management and organization**, as the use of a pipeline architecture assists in organizing and categorizing large datasets, making it easier to manage and navigate the literature.

6.2 Limitations and Future Work

The use of automation and, in particular, generative models introduces a set of challenges, and our approach faces several limitations: While we have shown through our evaluation that LLM-agent-based filtration **can be feasible**, we remain **cautious** to generalize from this too much, and this remains the main limitation of our study:

While the prompt is rather basic, we have evaluated *one single large corpus and prompt*, and it may not generalize well to other research areas, as prompt format, corpora specifics, or style *could* affect performance. However, given the minimum effort prompt and the general tendencies across models, we think that LLMs—which typically excel at text comprehension—can be feasible for literature filtration, and their exact capabilities and limitations should be investigated further.

Further, well-known issues like hallucinations, bias in training data, repetitiveness, and accuracy concerns are inherent in large language models, and significant research concerning these topics is conducted. In relation to literature filtrations, one important aspect is the responsible usage of LLMs in a structured and constrained environment. Thus, to ensure **completeness**, we do not use generative AI to conduct the search itself, but include them as classification agents as part of a structured schema, defining how a trusted initial corpus is built and how the agents are leveraged, to avoid fake references [8]. Despite high accuracy, generative AI can still generate incorrect or misleading information, leading to **accuracy concerns**. This might particularly depend on the quality of the model, as we have shown, as well as the prompt format and quality in itself, which is the subject of further studies. The language models might lack deep contextual understanding or ambiguity, and jargon may be difficult and specific to certain fields, affecting the accuracy. In our work, we did not focus too much on **prompt engineering** [23], which could further strengthen the results. Also, we did, in principle, use **zero-shot learning**—but with context examples—whereas few-shot learning attempts could lead to improved accuracy at the cost of more tokens. The models may exhibit **inherent biases** either already in the data, their training, or the Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) process, which can lead to biased or incomplete results [3]. Addressing these biases, for example, through interactive feedback loops and visual analytics approaches [7] is crucial for accurate research. The SOTA commercial models have

shown the highest performance but face **access limitations** through cost, availability, and rate limits, which might introduce an unfair advantage to established research groups [5], putting individual researchers or smaller groups at a disadvantage. Developing robust **metrics to evaluate** the effectiveness and accuracy of LLM-generated literature surveys is essential subject for future work. Additionally, excessive **over-reliance on automation and dependence** on AI models could diminish critical thinking and analytical skills [5] among researchers. Balancing automation with human oversight [7] is necessary.

Based on these challenges, there are several potential future research directions, such as Interactive Literature Review Platforms: Developing interactive platforms where LLMs assist researchers in a **collaborative environment** can make literature reviews more dynamic and responsive. For example, also by integrating **user feedback mechanisms** as part of a UI survey builder framework. In our work, we restricted the LLM agents to classification tasks, but this could—with access to the actual paper as PDF, which often is still behind paywalls—extend to the **semi-automatic coding** of papers and to evaluate the interpretative capabilities of language models further. Finally, one could leverage higher throughput for **broader and even cross-disciplinary analysis** by using our approach to perform a systematic literature survey across multiple disciplines to foster interdisciplinary research, where it might previously have been infeasible for larger topics.

7 CONCLUSION

In this work, we evaluate the potential of Large Language Models (LLMs) and generative AI for enhancing the filtration process in academic literature reviews. Our approach, consisting of a conceptual schema to conduct filtration for systematic literature reviews semi-automatically, utilizes a set of recent foundation models, specifically Llama3 (8B and 70B), Gemini 1.5 Flash, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, and GPT-4o, as classification agents to filter through a large corpus of scraped academic articles relevant for a particular research question. This addresses the limitations of traditional keyword-based filtering methods that are often hindered by semantic ambiguities and inconsistent terminology, requiring time- and labor-intensive manual filtering and checks. We evaluate the real-world performance of LLM-based agents during the construction of a recent literature survey paper and compare it with human performance on the same initial dataset containing 8,323 articles. Our results demonstrate that employing LLMs can significantly accelerate the literature review process, reducing the search space by an order of magnitude and reducing what typically takes weeks into mere minutes while maintaining recall (> 98%) at or even below the typical human error threshold. The efficiency introduced by LLMs not only improves the literature review process but also paves the way for broader applications in academic research, promising substantial improvements in how scholarly work is conducted. Future research can extend these techniques to aspects such as more nuanced relevance scoring or paper coding and compare the relevance of the prompting scheme more closely. This work demonstrates the viable use of AI in streamlining academic processes, underscoring the potential of using large language models in academia in a responsible manner.

REFERENCES

- Semi-automated screening of biomedical citations for systematic reviews. *BMC bioinformatics*, 11:1–11, 2010. 1, 2
- [1] S. Agarwal, I. H. Laradji, L. Charlin, and C. Pal. Litllm: A toolkit for scientific literature review, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2402.01788 2
- [2] S. A. Antu, H. Chen, and C. K. Richards. Using llm (large language model) to improve efficiency in literature review for undergraduate research. 2023. 2
- [3] Y. Bai, A. Jones, K. Ndousse, A. Askell, A. Chen, N. DasSarma, D. Drain, S. Fort, D. Ganguli, T. Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022. 4
- [4] G. Bello and V. Colombari. The human factors in risk analyses of process plants: The control room operator model ‘teseo’. *Reliability engineering*, 1(1):3–14, 1980. 3
- [5] R. Bommasani, D. A. Hudson, E. Adeli, R. Altman, S. Arora, S. von Arx, M. S. Bernstein, J. Bohg, A. Bosselut, E. Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021. 4
- [6] J. Davis, K. Mengersen, S. Bennett, and L. Mazerolle. Viewing systematic reviews and meta-analysis in social research through different lenses. *SpringerPlus*, 3:1–9, 2014. 1, 2
- [7] M. T. Fischer, S. D. Hirsbrunner, W. Jentner, M. Miller, D. A. Keim, and P. Helm. Promoting ethical awareness in communication analysis: Investigating potentials and limits of visual analytics for intelligence applications. In *Proceedings of FAccT '22 : 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAccT '22, pp. 877–889. Association for Computing Machinery, 2022. doi: 10.1145/3531146.3533151 4
- [8] M. U. Hadi, R. Qureshi, A. Shah, M. Irfan, A. Zafar, M. B. Shaikh, N. Akhtar, J. Wu, S. Mirjalili, et al. A survey on large language models: Applications, challenges, limitations, and practical usage. *Authorea Preprints*, 2023. 4
- [9] P. Humphreys. Human reliability assessors guide: an overview. *Human factors and decision making: their influence on safety and reliability*, 1988. 3
- [10] A. Kirkovska. Llm benchmarks: Overview, limits and model comparison. <https://www.vellum.ai/blog/llm-benchmarks-overview-limits-and-model-comparison>, 2024. 3
- [11] B. Kirwan. A comparative evaluation of five human reliability assessment techniques. In *Human Factors and Decision Making: Their influence on safety and reliability*. 1988. 3
- [12] B. Kirwan. *A guide to practical human reliability assessment*. CRC press, 2017. 3
- [13] G. Lame. Systematic literature reviews: An introduction. In *Proceedings of the design society: international conference on engineering design*, vol. 1, pp. 1633–1642. Cambridge University Press, 2019. 1, 2
- [14] A. Nightingale. A guide to systematic literature reviews. *Surgery (Oxford)*, 27(9):381–384, 2009. 1, 2
- [15] H. Rathi, A. Malik, D. Behera, and G. Kamboj. P21 a comparative analysis of large language models (llm) utilised in systematic literature review. *Value in Health*, 26(12):S6, 2023. 2
- [16] A. M. Sami, Z. Rasheed, K.-K. Kemell, M. Waseem, T. Kilamo, M. Saari, A. N. Duc, K. Systä, and P. Abrahamsson. System for systematic literature review using multiple ai agents: Concept and an empirical evaluation, 2024. doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2403.08399 2
- [17] E. M. d. Silva Júnior and M. L. Dutra. A roadmap toward the automatic composition of systematic literature reviews. *Iberoamerican Journal of Science Measurement and Communication*, 1(2):1–22, July 2021. doi: 10.47909/ijsmc.52 1, 2
- [18] D. J. Smith and K. G. Simpson. Chapter 5 - reliability modeling techniques. In D. J. Smith and K. G. Simpson, eds., *Safety Critical Systems Handbook*, pp. 89–106. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 2011. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-096781-3.10005-7 3
- [19] H. Snyder. Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104:333–339, Nov. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039 1, 2
- [20] T. Susnjak. Prisma-dflm: An extension of prisma for systematic literature reviews using domain-specific finetuned large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14905*, 2023. 2
- [21] R. Van Dinter, B. Tekinerdogan, and C. Catal. Automation of systematic literature reviews: A systematic literature review. *Information and Software Technology*, 136:106589, 2021. 1, 2
- [22] B. C. Wallace, T. A. Trikalinos, J. Lau, C. Brodley, and C. H. Schmid.